

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIE RAY BEASLEY,

Petitioner,

No. 2:05-cv-0851 JAM KJN P

vs.

CLAUDE E. FINN, et al.,

Respondents.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION


Petitioner is proceeding without counsel on a petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner challenges a 2002 denial of parole by the Board of Parole Hearings. On May 7, 2009, counsel for respondents filed a notice that petitioner was paroled on April 22, 2009, after being found suitable for parole in a 2008 hearing by the Board of Parole hearings. On February 12, 2010, the court ordered petitioner to show cause within thirty days why this action should not be dismissed as moot. Petitioner has not responded or otherwise responded to the court's order.

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-

1 one days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written  
2 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned  
3 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Any response to the  
4 objections shall be filed and served within fourteen days after service of the objections. The  
5 parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to  
6 appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

7 DATED: April 30, 2010

8  
9  
10   
11 KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
13

14 beas0851.dsm  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26